IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA NO. 1:23-CV-00423

TIMIA CHAPLIN; SARAH FIELDS; SYELINE NUNEZ; THOMAS HAYWARD; KEVIN SPRUILL; ROTESHA MCNEIL; QIANA ROBERTSON; YOUSEF JALLAL; MESSIEJAH BRADLEY; DENNIS KEITH LASSITER; PAULINO CASTELLANOS; ROBERT LEWIS; and ALLEN SIFFORD, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

GARY L. MCFADDEN, officially, as the Sheriff of Mecklenburg County; JOHN DOE SURETY, as surety for the Sheriff of Mecklenburg County; WILLIE R. ROWE, officially, as the Sheriff of Wake County; BRIAN ESTES, officially, as the Sheriff of Lee County; THE OHIO CASUALTY INSURANCE COMPANY, as surety for the Sheriffs of Wake County and Lee County; TYLER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.; NORTH CAROLINA ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS; RYAN BOYCE, officially, as the Executive Director of the North Carolina Administrative Office of the Courts; BRAD FOWLER, officially, as the eCourts Executive Sponsor and Chief Business Officer of the North Carolina Administrative Office of the Courts; ELISA CHINN-GARY, individually and officially, as the Mecklenburg County Clerk of Superior Court; BLAIR WILLIAMS, individually and officially, as the Wake County Clerk of Superior Court; SUSIE K. THOMAS, individually and officially, as the Lee County Clerk of Superior Court; and DOES 1 THROUGH 20, INCLUSIVE,

Defendants.

ORDER

This matter comes before the court on defendant WILLIE R. ROWE's, in his official capacity as the Sheriff of Wake County ("Defendant Rowe"), Consent Motion for Extension of Time to Reply to Plaintiff's Response in Opposition to Defendant Rowe's Motion to Dismiss. Defendant Rowe moves the court for an extension of time from May 28, 2024 until June 7, 2024, to file his Reply brief to Plaintiff's Response in Opposition to Defendant Rowe's Motion to Dismiss [DE No. 102]. Having considered the motion, with the consent of Plaintiffs, and for good cause shown, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendant Rowe's Consent Motion for Extension of Time to Reply to Plaintiff's Response in Opposition to Defendant Rowe's Motion to Dismiss is GRANTED, and Defendant Rowe may have until and including June 7, 2024, in which to answer or otherwise respond to Plaintiff's Response in Opposition to Defendant Rowe's Motion to Dismiss.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

. 2024.

This the

day of